



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,629	12/17/2003	Avery Fong	246161US2CONT	4751
22850	7590	06/25/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET			TSUI, WILSON W	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/25/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/736,629	Applicant(s) FONG ET AL.
	Examiner WILSON TSUI	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-11,13-15,17-19,21-23,25-30,32 and 33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-11,13-15,17-19,21-23,25-30,32 and 33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final action is in response to the amendment filed on 02/27/09.
2. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are amended. Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 31, 34, and 35 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, 25-30, and 32-33 are pending.
3. The 35 USC 112 rejections for claims 1, 9, and 17 are withdrawn, as necessitated by applicant's amendment.
 - Claims 1, 9, 17, and 28-35 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linden et al.
 - Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 13-15, 18, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linden et al, in further view of Rada et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regards to claim 1, the claimed "additional element for no corresponding element" is unclear, since it is unclear if the additional element is part of the second list of elements that are displayed. Furthermore, if the displayed second list is associated with an additional element, then it corresponds to the additional element. Thus, it is confusing as to what the "no corresponding element" is referring to. It appears that the

applicant intends that the no-corresponding element to be a "no-corresponding element data type", but the examiner is unsure.

With regards to claims 9 and 17, they include similar language with regards to "an additional element for no corresponding element", and are rejected under similar rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 28-35 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Linden et al ("Alchemist: A General Purpose Transformation Generator", published: June 1996, publisher: software-practice and Experience, pages: 653-675).

With regards to claim 1, Linden et al teaches:

Inputting, into a map editor with a graphical user interface, a first structural description of a first native native structured format (Figure 1, page 658: whereas the user inputs a first structural grammar of a first native structure format);

Displaying a first list of elements in the first structural description in the graphical user interface (Figure 1, page 658: whereas a first list of elements are shown in a first source structural grammar);

Displaying a second list of elements in the second structural description in the graphical user interface with an additional element for no corresponding element (Figure 1, page 658: whereas, a second list of elements are shown in a second target grammar.

Additionally, some of the elements described in the second list might not be a corresponding element, depending on which elements in the second list are selected via the rules defined in a mapping editor);

Inputting, into the map editor with the graphical user interface, a second structural description of a second native structured format (Figure 1, page 658: whereas the user inputs a second structural grammar of a second native structure format);

Inputting, into the map editor by a user with the graphical user interface, preferences for transforming an element in the first list to one of no corresponding element, one corresponding element or multiple corresponding elements of the second list by choosing elements in the second list; (Figure 1, page 658, 659: whereas, the user inputs a mapping through production associations, such that one or more elements of a first structural description are transformed to at least one element of a second structural description. Whereas one or more elements in the target grammar list can be non-

selected/non-corresponding, depending on the mapping performed. The mapping editor, used to implant rules to selecting how and which elements are selected for each source and target grammar structures in the first and second lists);

Storing translation information output from the map editor, the translation information comprising at least the preferences input by the user (Figure 1, pages 658 and 659: whereas code is compiled to produce translation information, based upon associations/preferences specified by the user);

and transforming a first document or database structure provided in the first native structured format directly into a second document or data structure in the second native native structured format based on the translation information (Figure 1, pages 658 and 659: whereas, compiled code is thus executed by the computer to transform a first document into a second document).

With regards to claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 28, which depends on claim 1, Linden et al teaches *generating transformation information based upon database design information* (page 659: specified through grammar), *document type* (page 665: whereas, based on the type of elements within the document, transformation information is further generated), and a *document* (page 663: whereas a source document is used to generate additional transformation data).

With regards to claim 29, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 28, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 30, which depends on claim 17, for a computer-readable medium encoded with instructions, which perform a method similar to the method of claim 28, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 31, which depends on claim 1, Linden et al teaches *displaying the graphical user interface*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. Additionally, Linden et al further explains the graphical user interface *includes a first area that displays a list of tags of the first native native structured format* (page 656, figure 1: a first area is shown in the source grammar window), *a second area that displays a tag of the second native native structured format that a selected tag from the first area maps to* (page 656, figure 1: a second area is shown in the target grammar window); *and creating a mapping between the first native*

native structured format and the second native native structured format based on contents of the first and second areas (page 656, figure 1: whereas the mapper tool (third area) is used to define a mapping, and the spell tool is used to compile/generate the mapping). The third area *that displays a list of legal tags which can follow a last tag in the second area* (page 661, and page 663: whereas, the third area (mapper tool) is used to define and display a list of legal tags by selecting productions and symbols to implement spells. The spells used to allow certain tags to follow a last tag based on order of structure data for output/transformation).

With regards to claim 32, which depends on claim 1, Linden et al teach *editing, with the graphical user interface, an existing map that transforms the first document or database structure provided in the first native native structured format into the second document or database structure in the second native native structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 31 (through the use of the mapper tool and spell tool), and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 33, which depends on claim 1, Linden et al teach *creating, with the graphical user interface, a map that transforms the first document or database structure provided in the first native native structured format into the second document or database structure in the second native native structured format* (through the use of the mapper tool and spell tool), as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 31, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 35, which depends on claim 1, the Linden et al teaches *breaking down a structure of the first document or database structure into source components and structure based on the first native native structured format; Presenting the source components and structure to the user through the graphical user interface of the map editor; Interactively selecting, by the user through the graphical user interface, components of the first native native structured format with candidate target components of the second native native structured format; and interactively selecting, by the user through the graphical user interface, target components of the candidate target components for a mapping of the source components for creation of a rule for a transformation map* (page 656, 658, Figure 1: whereas, a structure is broken down and the source components of the first native native structured format are presented in the mapper tool editor for selection by the user , desired candidate target components of a second native native structured format; such that a rule is created for a transformation.)

6. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 13-15, 18, 19, 21-23, and 25-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linden et al ("Alchemist: A General Purpose Transformation Generator", published: June 1996, publisher: software-practice and Experience, pages: 653-675), in further view of Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117).

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Linden et al teaches *transforming the first structured document and first native native structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Linden et al does not expressly teach the first native native structured format *has a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy*.

Yet, Rada et al teaches transforming *the first structured document, the first native native structured format has a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy* (page 102: whereas, the first native structured format, can be SGML (which includes a DTD), such that the second format will be a structural format for a hypertext system). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Linden et al's transformation method, such that the first structured document has a native structured format having a DTD directed hierarchy, as taught by Rada et al. The combination would have allowed Linden et al to have made it easier to generate translators between different markups (Rada et al, page 100).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, the combination of Linden et al and Rada teaches wherein *the transforming includes transforming the document and said first native native structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Linden et al teaches *transforming the second structured document and second native native structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Linden et al does not expressly teach the second native native structured format *has a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy*.

Yet, Rada et al teaches transforming *wherein the second native native structured format is a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy* (page 102: whereas, the second native structured format, can be the open and interchange layer, and the first native structured format can be the text markup language, such that the second native structured format is SGML (which includes a DTD)).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Linden et al's transformation method, such that the second structured document has a native structured format having a DTD directed hierarchy, as taught by Rada et al. The combination would have allowed Linden et al to have The combination would have allowed Linden et al to have made it easier go generate translators between different markups (Rada et al, page 100).

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 3, Linden et al teaches further comprising: *outputting, from the editor to a graphical user interface, a representation of a translation between the first native native structured format and the second native native structured format* (Figure 1, page 658: whereas, the editor includes a spell tool to show and allow the user to view translation preferences, the translations used to

implement associations between the first and second native structured format).

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 3, the combination of Linden et al and Rada teaches wherein *the second native structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13. which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14. which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 25, which depends on claim 1, Linden et al teaches *wherein the preferences for transforming include a user selection of which elements of the first*

native structured format to map to the second native structured format (Figure 1, page 666: whereas a list of spells can be selected as preferred transformation steps).

With regards to claim 26, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method performed in claim 25, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 27, which depends on claim 17, for a computer readable medium encoded with instructions which perform a method similar to the method performed in claim 25, is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 02/27/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
8. The applicant first argues that Linden is silent regarding the specific amended limitations including "a first list of elements in the first structural description in the graphical user interface", [and] "a second list of elements in the second structural description in the graphical user interface with an additional element for no corresponding element", [and] "there is no disclosure that the interface on page 656 of Linden is used to input " into the map editor by a user with the graphical user interface, preferences for transforming an element in the first list to one or no corresponding element, one corresponding element, or multiple corresponding elements of the second list by choosing elements in the second list".

However these arguments are not persuasive since as explained above Linden teaches the limitations including:

- a first list of elements in the first structural description in the graphical user interface" (Figure 1, page 658: whereas a first list of elements are shown in a first source structural grammar);
- "a second list of elements in the second structural description in the graphical user interface with an additional element for no corresponding element" (Figure 1, page 658: whereas, a second list of elements are shown in a second target grammar. Additionally, some of the elements described in the second list might not be a corresponding element, depending on which elements in the second list are selected via the rules defined in a mapping editor);
- input " into the map editor by a user with the graphical user interface, preferences for transforming an element in the first list to one or no corresponding element, one corresponding element, or multiple corresponding elements of the second list by choosing elements in the second list (Figure 1, page 658, 659: whereas, the user inputs a mapping through production associations, such that one or more elements of a first structural description are transformed to at least one element of a second structural description. Whereas one or more elements in the target grammar list can be non-selected/non-corresponding, depending on the mapping performed. The mapping editor, used to implant rules to selecting how

and which elements are selected for each source and target grammar structures in the first and second lists);

9. Additionally, it appears the applicant is arguing that the selection in the second list of elements must be implemented, by using a selection tool/cursor to select within the physical dimension/scope of the list. However, this is not expressly defined in the claim language, and the applicant is suggested to clarify that the method of selection, to distinguish from the prior art.

10. The applicant further argues that Rada fails to teach the amended limitations. However, this argument is not persuasive since as explained above, Linden teaches the amended limitations.

11. The applicant argues that claims 9 and 17 recite elements analogous to those of claim 1, and are thus allowable for similar reasons. Yet, this argument is not persuasive since claims 1 has been shown to be rejected, as similarly explained above.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILSON TSUI whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CESAR B PAULA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/Wilson Tsui/
Patent Office
Art Unit: 2178
June 17, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/736,629
Art Unit: 2178

Page 17